



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/644,110

08/20/2003

Peter Hans Redweik

11202

6514

26890

7590

02/16/2010

JAMES M. STOVER  
TERADATA CORPORATION  
2835 MIAMI VILLAGE DRIVE  
MIAMISBURG, OH 45342

EXAMINER

LEMIEUX, JESSICA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3693

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/16/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/644,110	<b>Applicant(s)</b> REDWEIK, PETER HANS	
	<b>Examiner</b> JESSICA L. LEMIEUX	<b>Art Unit</b> 3693	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/1/2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-21,23-29,31-41,43-49 and 51-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-21,23-29,31-41,43-49 and 51-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Non-Final Office action is in response to the application filed on August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2003 and in response to the applicant's arguments/amendments filed on November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-21, 23-29, 31-41, 43-49 and 51-60 are pending.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 3-9, 11-21, 23-29, 31-41, 43-49 and 51-60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

An element in a claim for combination may be expressed as a means or step for performing a specified function without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof, and such claim shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof.

3. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-21, 23-29, 31-41, 43-49 and 51-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, as the claim limitation "the step of applying the NPV forecast rules " uses the phrase "means for" or "step for", but it is modified by some structure, material, or acts recited in the claim. It is unclear whether the recited structure, material, or acts are sufficient for performing the claimed function which would preclude application of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph.

If applicant wishes to have the claim limitation treated under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, applicant is required to amend the claim so that the phrase "means for" or

Art Unit: 3693

“step for” is clearly **not** modified by sufficient structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed function.

If applicant does **not** wish to have the claim limitation treated under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, applicant is required to amend the claim so that it will clearly not be a means (or step) plus function limitation (e.g., deleting the phrase “means for” or “step for”).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-21, 23-29, 31-41, 43-49 and 51-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not directed to a secondary statutory subject matter/class. ***Examiner notes that steps (c), (d) and (e) do not involve the performance by a computer.***

Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must be (1) tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process under § 101 and should be rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In addition to being tied to another statutory class, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recites the subject matter that is being

transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. See *In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008). Merely having “another statutory class” in the preamble and not in the body of the claim is also not sufficient to render the claim statutory.

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

The particular machine tie or particular transformation must meet two corollaries to pass the test for subject matter eligibility. First, the use of the particular machine or transformation of the particular article must impose a **meaningful limit** on the claim’s scope. So, a machine tie in only a field-of-use limitation would not be sufficient. This means the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the method claim’s scope to pass the test. Second, the use of the particular machine or the transformation of the particular article must involve **more than insignificant “extra-solution” activity**. If the machine or transformation is only present in a field-of-use limitation or in a step that is only insignificant “extra-solution” activity, such a data gathering or outputting, the claim fails the M-or-T test, despite the presence of a machine or a transformation in the claim.

Art Unit: 3693

A method claim that fails to meet one of the above requirements is not in compliance with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 for patent eligible subject matter. Here claims 1, 3-9, 11-21, 23-29, 31-41, 43-49 and 51-60 fail to meet the above requirements since there is neither a physical transformation nor a sufficient tie to another statutory class, such as hardware. Thus, it is unclear as to whether or not the claims are mere processes that involve purely human labor and further the claims as amended can be read as solely software per se and examiner request actual physical hardware to be used..

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3693

5. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-21, 23-29, 31-41, 43-49 and 51-60 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of copending Application No. 10/644169, 10/644421, 10/644131, and 10/644171.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all inventions are drawn to selecting accounts, forecast amounts, attrition and/or propensity rates and using them to perform Net Present Value and/or Future Value calculations.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Examiner notes that claims 1, 3-9, 11-21, 23-29, 31-41, 43-49 and 51-60 will be allowable over the prior art upon applicant's corrections of all 35 U.S.C. 112, 101 and Double Patenting rejections.

#### ***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JESSICA L. LEMIEUX whose telephone number is (571)270-3445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3693

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jessica L Lemieux  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3693

/J. L. L./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3693  
February 2010

/Stefanos Karmis/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693